



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

had, but of this confidence there may be too much at times. The people have not had the least intention, as charged by one senator, of interfering with an important diplomatic negotiation while in progress. What they have wanted is that it should "progress" with proper rapidity, and not be killed by indifference or opposition. Nobody has supposed that the treaty could be ratified in "24 hours," though it would be incomparably better to have this hasty action than to have the treaty so changed as to make its rejection by Great Britain certain. If the attitude of senators had not been halting and seemingly unfavorable the public would have kept still. They would have cared little whether the examination of the treaty's provisions took one week or ten.

Now that the Senate and the people understand each other, the treaty is receiving due consideration in Committee, and is likely soon to be reported to the Senate. Whatever opposition there may have been to it at first for narrow, selfish and partizan reasons, seems to have disappeared. The only serious trouble now seems to be in reference to the Monroe Doctrine and the Nicaragua Canal. We have no doubt that whatever difficulties there may be in these directions—and we have not space now to discuss them—will be gotten over in some way and that the Senate will soon give the civilized world the great pleasure of hearing that it has set the seal of its approval to what one of the writers in our symposium calls "one of the greatest papers in human annals."

Since the above was written the Committee on Foreign Affairs has acted on the treaty, and on Monday, Feb. 1st, reported it to the Senate in executive session. The Committee made several changes in the treaty, the two most important of which were that King Oscar of Sweden should not name the umpire in case the tribunal should fail to do so, and that questions of domestic and foreign policy should be expressly excluded from the operation of the compact except by special agreement. These amendments seem to be entirely unnecessary, and the one as to questions of policy seems to some to render the treaty almost valueless. We think, however, that in actual practice this would not prove the case. Much more serious is the actual hostility developed in the Committee to the whole treaty, four members, Morgan, Mills, Daniel and Cameron, having voted not to report it at all. If the opposition in the Senate proves to be proportionally large the treaty must fail. We cannot believe that such will be the case, though, as we write, Morgan and others are doing their worst to prevent ratification. Public sentiment in favor of the treaty continues to accumulate, and we do not comprehend how senators can be so blind as to trifle with a measure of such far-reaching value. If the free silver senators wish to destroy absolutely all confidence in their sincerity and patriotism, they can not accomplish this end more quickly than by trying to defeat this treaty because of their financial dislike of England.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The signing of the Olney-Pauncefote treaty of arbitration on the 11th of January took place in Secretary Olney's office at the State Department at 12.20 o'clock. Sir Julian Pauncefote was accompanied by Viscount Gough, the First Secretary of the British Embassy. Richard Olney had present as the witness for this Government Mr. Thomas W. Creidler, Chief of the Diplomatic Bureau, and Mr. Blandford, his private secretary, to whom the pen with which the document was signed was given as a souvenir. Before signing the two chief actors communicated to each other their "full powers." Sir Julian Pauncefote produced a large sheet of parchment which at great length recited that he was empowered to sign the treaty. The parchment bore the well-known "Victoria R" of the queen. Attached to the credentials by a thick silver and red cord was a silver box. The cover bore a beautifully embossed copy of the royal arms of Great Britain. Inside the box was a wax impression of the great seal of England. Sir Julian handed the parchment and the box over to Mr. Olney, who looked at it with interest. Mr. Olney's credentials were simply a sheet of paper, of the regulation State Department size, on which President Cleveland had written a few words empowering him to sign the treaty. After they had satisfied themselves that their respective credentials were in due form, Secretary Olney sat down at his desk and put his signature at the foot of both copies of the treaty, which had been prepared in duplicate. He then handed the pen to Sir Julian Pauncefote who signed his name in full to both papers. Mr. Olney put a seal opposite his signature and wrote over it the initials "R. O." Sir Julian used as a seal a copy of his family crest. Then the two men shook hands and congratulated each other over what they had accomplished.

On the 17th of January, the first Sabbath after the signing of the Arbitration Treaty, the ministers in many of the pulpits of the country either made allusion to the subject or preached sermons on it. It was characterized by them almost universally as one of the greatest events in the history of Christian civilization. The Christian pulpits of the United States and England during the past year have been the foremost agency, we hesitate not to say, in bringing about that manifestation of public sentiment which made the negotiation and signing of this treaty possible. They turned the Venezuela war craze into a craze for peace. On the Sabbath which followed the scare in December, 1895, they gave the first strong drift to public opinion in favor of lasting friendship between the English speaking peoples. Their influence has again been thrown mightily on the side of truth. In their recent utterance they spoke for the speedy and hearty

ratification of the treaty, when there was already wavering in the Senate and talk of delay or of rejection for paltry and unworthy reasons. The pulpit ought always to have been the stronghold of peace. Let us hope that having come to a consciousness of its great power in this direction it may never again be false to its high mission. When the pulpit speaks it should always be the voice of the Prince of Peace which is heard.

The Venezuela settlement and the signing of the general arbitration treaty with this country were alluded to in the Queen's speech on the reöpening of Parliament, the 19th ult., in the following terms:

My government has discussed with the United States, as a friend of Venezuela, the terms under which the pending questions of a disputed frontier between that republic and British Guiana may be equitably submitted to arbitration. An arrangement has been arrived at with that government which will, I trust, effect an adjustment of the existing controversies without exposing to risk the interests of any colonists who have established rights in the disputed territory.

It is with much gratification that I have concluded a treaty for general arbitration with the President of the United States, by which I trust that all differences that may arise between us will be peacefully adjusted. I hope that this arrangement may have further value in commending to other powers the consideration of the principle by which the danger of war may be notably abated.

In the discussion on the motion for an address in reply to the speech, the Earl of Kimberly, the newly chosen leader of the Liberal Party, congratulated Lord Salisbury on the success of the negotiations with the United States. The Prime Minister, speaking on the subject, said that it must not be thought that the treaty would bring on the millenium. It would do something to diminish the risks of war, though it might not restrain a Napoleon or a Bismark, should such appear. It would make certain the peaceful settlement of the large number of small differences between the two countries which were liable to be exaggerated and develop into hostilities. Even in the case of serious matters, a minister who should submit to arbitration a question which was thought to involve the honor of his country, could not be charged with trifling when he had turned over the case to an impartial tribunal. He thought the measure would be influential towards bringing about disarmament in Europe where the nations were groaning under their burdens, and that the effort, small as it was, would lead to large experiments in the same direction. Allusion was made to the subject also in the House of Commons, in the most congratulatory terms, by Sir William V. Harcourt, and also by the Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour. Mr. Harcourt said there could be no more fitting celebration of the 60th year of Queen Victoria's reign than that her Government should be among the first to set the example of settling differences by arbitration.

In an address before the Merchants' Association of Boston on Jan. 15th, Governor Wolcott paid a high tribute to Secretary Olney for his work in the negotiation of the arbitration treaty with Great Britain. These were his words:

Gentlemen, this organization represents not alone the business enterprise, but it represents fairly, I believe, the loyal and patriotic citizenship of Boston and of Massachusetts. And, representing as you do, the enlightened citizenship of New England, I have no doubt that you will agree with me when I say that in my opinion the last week will be memorable in the history of the world for what I conceive to be a great achievement in international statesmanship.

I do not speak to you, gentlemen, as one upon whom rests the great responsibility of passing judgment in detail upon the minute provisions of the great treaty of arbitration. I speak simply as a citizen of the United States of America, and one whose privilege it is to live in these closing years of the nineteenth century.

I think that these years, among many other great achievements of civilization, of advancing Christianity, will be remarkable in the future history of the world for an attempt, at least, to establish a great tribunal representing the two foremost nations of the world to which shall hereafter, for a limited period at first, but we believe for perpetuity, be committed the decision of great questions of international differences.

Tribunals of arbitration have been established before this, but, if my memory serves me, they have been established to adjudge special causes and after irritation had reached the danger point. This new treaty marks, it seems to me, an important advance in that, before matters of international difference have reached the danger point or the point of irritation, it shall be a matter of public knowledge in the two nations that a tribunal is established to pass upon such questions without invoking the dread arbitrament of war.

This great achievement, as it seems to me, gives a fitting close to the years of this century. In the opening years of this century such an idea, even if conceived, would have seemed to be the Utopian dream of some visionary, and, gentlemen, as a citizen of Massachusetts, I am glad that the shaping hand was the hand of a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The interest in Massachusetts in the arbitration treaty with Great Britain has been deep and practically universal. The State Legislature, on the 28th ult., after an interesting debate, passed a resolution in support of such a treaty by a vote of 141 to 11. These eleven Representatives, who must have felt either very heroic or very lonesome when they heard the result of the vote, objected principally because of their fear of the crowned heads of Europe and the suspected sinister purposes of Great Britain. If this vote may be taken as any indication of the drift of things, it would seem that the anti-arbitrationists are soon to become an extinct race.

A number of people have been greatly distressed by all sorts of "black spirits" which the twilight enveloping

them has led them to think they see back of the arbitration treaty. Here is a deep and brilliant suggestion from the *Catholic Review*:

"If the arbitration treaty with England is approved by the Senate, it will most likely turn out to be a gold brick the very first time that there is occasion for its use. We fear John Bull more when he is willing to bind himself to negotiate than when he affirms that he will do nothing but fight."

Boston has lost one of its most eminent and useful citizens in the death of Francis A. Walker, who died suddenly of apoplexy on January 5th, at the age of 57. He had been for fifteen years president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and had brought that institution up to a grade of efficiency where it had no superior. Previously he had been professor of political economy and history in the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College, lecturer at both Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities, Commissioner of Indian affairs, Superintendent of the Census in 1870 and in 1880, and for a time Deputy Special Commissioner of United States Revenue. President Walker's public reputation rested very much on his work as an economist. He was the author of several books, prominent among which were "Money" and "The Wages Question." He was a thorough believer in international bimetalism and labored much in its behalf. Boston had no broader-minded or more public-spirited citizen than General Walker. He was a modest, unassuming man, but he was always willing, when asked, to accept any position of public trust when he could serve the community and help lift it to higher levels. Like his distinguished father, Amasa Walker, who was for forty years a leading member of the American Peace Society, going as a delegate to the first peace (London) congress ever held Francis Walker was much interested in the peace movement. He was not what is called a radical peace man. He believed that war is sometimes a necessity, but his whole nature was opposed to the spirit which creates and glorifies in war. In his address at the annual meeting of the American Peace Society last May, at which he presided, he took occasion to express his thorough dislike of "the cheap and vulgar jingoism" which would fan the flames of hatred and hurry the country into war. No war ever has its cause in the breast of a man as pure and generous as he was. We are greatly grieved to have to record his untimely death.

The will of Alfred Nobel, the inventor of dynamite, which was probated at Stockholm, Sweden, on the 30th of December, is an extremely interesting one. After giving several millions of crowns to about twenty relatives, he bequeathes the bulk of his fortune, about thirty-five million crowns, to five objects. The bequest is to be kept

as a permanent fund, and the interest accruing annually is to be distributed in prizes as follows: One-fifth part to the person who shall have made during the year the most important discovery or invention in the domain of physics; a fifth part to him who shall have made a like discovery or improvement in chemical science; a fifth part for like services in physiology or medicine; a fifth part for the best work in an ideal way in letters; and a fifth part for the most important service rendered in promoting the brotherhood of peoples, the reduction or abolition of standing armies, or the establishment and propagation of peace congresses. The prize for the best service in promoting peace is to be adjudged by a Committee of five to be appointed by the Norwegian Storting. It is estimated that the annual value of the prize will not be less than fifty thousand dollars. Though the inventor of the most terrible means of destruction, Alfred Nobel was a warm friend of the peace movement. The peace prize may be contested for by anyone in any nation, as may the others also.

The Lombard Peace Union, Milan, Italy, has just published its illustrated Peace Almanac for 1897, the eighth in the series. It covers more than a hundred pages, and about twenty Italian authors and one or two others have helped in its preparation. A great variety of subjects relating to peace and the methods of securing it are treated. It gives special attention to the disturbances of the past year in Abyssinia, Cuba and elsewhere, and to the various phases of the peace movement in Italy and elsewhere. The Almanac has been found by the Lombard Union a very useful means of propaganda.

The French peace women have sent the following letter to Menelik, King of Abyssinia:

"The women who execrate war, which is wholesale murder, who detest in our European civilization hatred between peoples, the spirit of conquest, the desire for revenge, disregard for the rights of the people with all the evils which it engenders, are happy to discover at last in you a true human soul, a just nature which knows how not to take advantage of victory and will not harbor the spirit of vengeance. Though compelled to defend yourself, you extend your hand to the conquered in relief and do not even ask of them a war indemnity. You treat as brothers and friends those whom the injustice of others has made your prisoners, and as far as in you lies, you undo the evils which you yourself have not done. If a lofty spirit of justice ruled in our European Society, King Menelik, we should not think it worth while to congratulate you for having done your duty, but in presence of the evil passions which poison with their breath our Occident, we bow down with a delighted and respectful surprise before an example of magnanimity which we have not yet had the opportunity of observing among our Europeans."

The General German Peace Society has succeeded in getting a very important resolution through the Reichstag

On its demand, the Committee on Petitions recently reported favorably a resolution asking the Reichstag to use its influence with the Imperial Government to induce it to coöperate with other governments in the organization of tribunals of arbitration. On the motion of the Committee, the Reichstag voted to transmit the petition to the Imperial Chancellor. Mr. Galler, in presenting the report of the Committee, made a strong speech in which he set forth what arbitration has already accomplished, and the efforts which are being made in many countries to establish it as a permanent principle of international action.

The National Red Cross Society, in response to a very general demand, has published a special illustrated edition of the Armenian Relief Report, covering one hundred and forty-three pages. Copies may be had by sending *thirty cents* to the American National Red Cross, Washington, D. C. The proceeds of the edition are to be used for the further relief of the Armenian sufferers, under the exclusive direction of the Red Cross.

The General Dutch Peace Union has just issued its year-book, a copy of which has come to our desk. The book contains a list of all the important peace societies of the world, a report of the last annual meeting of the Union at the Hague, a review of the events of the year 1896, an account of the meetings of the Peace Congress and the Interparliamentary conference at Buda-Pesth, and other interesting matter related to the peace movement. The Dutch Peace Union has been doing excellent work since its organization twenty-four years ago.

The International Peace Bureau at Berne, in accordance with instructions given by the Peace Congress at Buda-Pesth, has prepared an appeal to educators on the subject of the teaching of history. Copies of this have been sent out to the peace societies in the different countries, for use in promoting right opinion on the subject, with such modifications as may adapt the appeal to the educational systems of different lands. The matter of the correct teaching of history in the schools in regard to the subject of war has already received, and will continue to receive, careful attention in our columns.

The Report of the Evangelical Alliance for 1896, just issued, contains the following interesting passage touching the action of the Alliance in reference to arbitration with Great Britain:

"In January, prior to any action elsewhere, so far as we know, a committee was appointed, which was instructed to consider the best method of forming a national committee which should have for its object the achievement of some permanent provision for arbitration between Great Britain and the United States. There was a widespread sentiment in favor of arbitration throughout the

country, which found expression in many places in connection with the celebration of Washington's birthday, but the idea of calling a great national conference for the discussion of the whole subject and for the appointment of a national committee in the interest of some permanent provision for arbitration originated with the Evangelical Alliance.

"The Alliance committee charged with the matter took a broad and disinterested view of the situation, and, seeing that the movement should appeal to all good citizenship, Christian and Jewish, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, decided that it was wise for the Alliance to efface itself in the undertaking, rather than by appearing as the projector of the scheme, to prejudice its support on the part of any class of citizens.

"But, while the Evangelical Alliance was in no way publicly identified with the Washington arbitration conference, all its energies were enlisted in behalf of that important and historic gathering. Not only was the conference first suggested in the office of the Alliance, but each important step in preparation for it was there planned. The correspondence, involving the sending and receiving of several thousand letters, was there conducted, and officers of the Alliance were among the most active promoters of the enterprise, one of them giving his entire time to it for some three months.

"This conference was eminently successful in every respect, and there is reason to believe that it exerted an important influence, both on the United States and Great Britain, and unless the arbitration treaty now before the Senate fails of ratification it is not too much to hope that the Washington conference will have a permanent influence on civilization. Surely, it is occasion for congratulation and thanksgiving that the Alliance had any connection with so beneficent a project."

The Alliance is certainly to be congratulated for its timely, disinterested and thoroughly wise effort to promote this noble object through a national conference whose influence has been great and widespread. Nobody will begrudge it the honor of having been the *first* to suggest such a conference and indirectly the chief agency in securing its successful meeting. It was a great service. But many agencies contributed toward making the meeting a success. The American Peace Society might tell of *special* efforts, indirectly made of course, by which an exceptionally large and influential delegation was induced to go to the Conference from New England. It is impossible to tell of all the *first* things that are done in the history of any great movement like this. No such Conference as that at Washington could ever have been held, or even thought of, but for a long series of efforts extending through nearly the whole of this century. The old London Peace Society, still as vigorous as ever, could tell of a number of *first* things in Parliament and out of it. The International Arbitration and Peace Association, also of London, could tell of some other important *first* things. So could the International Arbitration League, also of London, whose Secretary, the Hon. W. R. Cremer, got up and brought a *first* and a *second* largely signed

memorial to Washington. The Universal Peace Union could tell of *first* things. And Mr. Smiley of Mohonk fame. What a multitude of *first* suggestions there were, by individuals and by societies, a year and more ago, after the Venezuela flurry, for meetings and conferences, for resolutions and petitions, in favor of permanent peace with Great Britain! The American Peace Society, which has done whole decades of work without sounding a trumpet before it, or behind it, might also, speaking after the manner of men, mention some *firsts*. Its President and Secretary might tell of a *first* and a *second* interview with the late Secretary Gresham, immediately after which the negotiations for the treaty of arbitration with Great Britain, as is now known, were first begun by him. The honor role in this first movement of the time is a long one. Let us not forget the difficult honors of those on whose foundations we are building.

TEXT OF THE ARBITRATION TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Signed at Washington the 11th of January, 1897, by RICHARD OLNEY and SIR JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

The United States of America and her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, being desirous of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily exist between them and of consecrating by treaty the people to international arbitration, have appointed for that purpose as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Hon. Richard Olney, Secretary of State of the United States, and her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Hon. Sir Julian Pauncefote, a member of her Majesty's most honorable Privy Council, knight grand cross of the most honorable Order of the Bath, and of the most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, and her Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States, who after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed to and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

The high contracting parties agree to submit to arbitration in accordance with the provisions and subject to the limitations of this treaty all questions in difference between them which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiation.

ARTICLE II.

All pecuniary claims or groups of pecuniary claims which do not in the aggregate exceed £100,000 in amount and which do not involve the determination of territorial claims, shall be dealt with and decided by an arbitral tribunal constituted as provided in the next following article. In this article and in article 4 the words "groups of pecuniary claims" mean pecuniary claims by one or more persons arising out of some transactions or involving the same issues of law and of fact.

ARTICLE III.

Each of the high contracting parties shall nominate one arbitrator, who shall be a jurist of repute, and the two arbitrators so nominated shall within two months of the date of their nomination select an umpire. In case they shall fail to do so within the limit of time above mentioned the umpire shall be appointed by agreement between the members for the time being of the Supreme Court of the United States and the members for the time being of the judicial committee of the privy council in Great Britain, each nominating body acting by a majority.

In case they shall fail to agree upon an umpire within three months of the date of an application made to them in that behalf by the high contracting parties or either of them, the umpire shall be selected in the manner provided for in article 10. The person so selected shall be the president of the tribunal and the award of the majority of the members thereof shall be final.

ARTICLE IV.

All pecuniary claims or groups of pecuniary claims which shall exceed £100,000 in amount and all other matters in difference, in respect of which either of the high contracting parties shall have rights against the other under treaty or otherwise, provided that such matters in difference do not involve the determination of territorial claims, shall be dealt with and decided by an arbitral tribunal constituted as provided in the next following article:

ARTICLE V.

Any subject of arbitration described in article 4 shall be submitted to the tribunal provided for by article 3, the award of which tribunal, if unanimous, shall be final. If not unanimous either of the contracting parties may within six months from date of the award demand a review thereof. In such case the matter in controversy shall be submitted to an arbitral tribunal consisting of five jurists of repute, no one of whom shall have been a member of the tribunal whose award is to be reviewed and who shall be selected as follows:

Two by each of the high contracting parties and one to act as umpire, by the four thus nominated and to be chosen within three months after the date of their nomination. In case they shall fail to choose an umpire within the limit of time above mentioned, the umpire shall be appointed by agreement between the nominating bodies designated in article 3, acting in the manner therein provided. In case they fail to agree upon an umpire within three months of the date of an application made to them in that behalf by the high contracting parties, or either of them, the umpire shall be selected in the manner provided for in article 10.

The person so selected shall be the president of the tribunal, and the award of the majority of the members thereof shall be final.

ARTICLE VI.

Any controversy which shall involve the determination of territorial claims shall be submitted to a tribunal composed of six members, three of whom (subject to the provisions of article 8) shall be judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, or justices of the Circuit Courts, to be nominated by the President of the United States, and the other three of whom (subject to the pro-